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ABSTRACT

This study examines the influence of credit risk management on the performance of Nigerian banks with particular reference to selected banks. Purposive sampling technique was used to select five Nigerian banks. Secondary data was used for this study. It was adopted from the audited financial statements of the listed banks in the Nigerian Stock Exchange (NSE), for the period of the year 2006 – 2017. This study also made use of Nigerian Stock Exchange Fact Book 2017 for the Nigerian banks and CBN bulletin 2017. The method of analysis used descriptive statistics and Linear Regressions. Result reveals that NLPR (β = 0.809), CARR (β = 11.246) and LTDR (β = 6.300) have significant influence on financial performance measured by ROA. Furthermore, the result also shows that CARR (β = 17.982) and LTDR (β = 3.227) have a significant influence on financial performance measured by ROE but NLPR (β = -1.57) has a negative influence on ROE. The study concludes that credit risk management apparatus employed by the selected banks for the periods of study have a significant influence on their financial performance.

*Corresponding author: Email: oyeoloruntoba01@yahoo.com;
The study, therefore, recommends that regulatory authorities should implement a new code of corporate governance that bank directors with non-performing loans (NPLs) are to either quit or be sacked and also banks' boards to remove any director with insider non-performing loans.

**Keywords:** Credit risk management; non-performing loan ratio; capital adequacy ratio; loan-deposit ratio.

1. **INTRODUCTION**

Financial institutions and their impact on economic growth and sustainable development have acknowledged by governments and academics in both developed and developing economies. The role of the financial sector in any economy is that of intermediation by mobilising savings from the areas of surpluses to those of deficits has well documented in the literature [1]. The emergence of 2007-08 global financial crises has made countries all over the world to recognise the role of financial sector development in sustaining economic growth and development especially in Africa, Nigeria in particular. For the banking sector to perform optimally and contribute significantly to economic growth and sustainable development, the sector embarked on series of financial reforms since 2004 to date. The reform was geared towards making the banks strong and reliable financial institution, and to ensure the safety of depositors fund [2].

In spite of these laudable efforts, the sector still witnessed several cases of collapses. This is evidenced by the recent revocation of Skye bank operation licence by Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), saying the decision was premised on the inability of the owners of the bank to shore up its capital after it received a N350 billion intervention in July 2016. The incessant distressed syndrome facing banking sector has eroded the confidence of both indigenous and foreign investors in the sector. This menace has been attributed to unsuccessful credit risk management [3]. In line with this revelation, Goin and Delhaise [4] admit that poor credits (asset quality) are the primary cause of banking crises across the world. In Nigeria, director of a new Code of Corporate Governance approved by the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) lamented that Banks’ assets have depreciated due to increase in provisions of Non-Performing Loan which has hit N856.9 billion [4]. According to Osuka and Amako [5], poor credit administration reduces bank profitability and leads to bank distress and/or failure.

Credit risk management has been identified by financial experts as a prerequisite to maximising bank risk, adjustment in risk rate of return by maintaining credit risk exposure with a view to shielding the bank from the adverse effects of credit risk. According to Bizuyayhu [6], the effective risk management system minimises the complexities involved in planning, executing and controlling the overall running of a business which is critical to success and this maximises profitability in business. Credit risk Management can be viewed as written guidelines that set the terms and conditions for supplying goods on credit, customer qualification criteria, the procedure for making collections, and steps to be taken in case of customer delinquency [7].

Pertinent question agitating the mind of researchers is; to what extent does credit risk management influence the financial performance of banks in Nigeria?

1.1 **Objective of the Study**

The main objective of this study is to examine the effect of credit risk management on the performance of Nigerian banks with particular reference to selected Banks.

1.2 **Research Hypothesis**

The following hypothesis is formulated for this study;

Ho: Credit risk management has no significant influence on the performance of banks in Nigeria.

H1: Credit risk management has a significant influence on the performance of banks in Nigeria.

2. **LITERATURE REVIEW**

2.1 **Concept of Credit Risk Management**

Credit risk management is germane to financial institutions as it is an integral part of the loan
process. According to Bizuayehu [6], Credit risk management maximises bank risk, adjusted risk rate of return by maintaining credit risk exposure with a view to shielding the bank from the adverse effects of credit risk. Banks are investing a lot of funds in credit risk. Mottef [8] sees credit risk management as a practice of systematically selecting cost effective approaches for minimising the effect of threat realisation to the organisation. All risks can never be fully avoided or mitigated simply because of financial and practical limitations [8]. According to Fathi et al. [9], credit risk management refers to the systematic application of management policies, procedures and practices to the tasks of identifying, analysing, assessing, treating and monitoring risk. In another study, Hubbard [10] defines credit risk management as the identification, assessment, and prioritisation of risks followed by coordinated and economical application of resources to minimise, monitor, and control the probability and/or impact of unfortunate events or to maximise the realisation of opportunities.

Duffie and Singleton [11] elaborate risk management as the process of adjusting both the risk of large losses and the firm’s vulnerability to them. This vulnerability depends on the portfolio of positions and on the amount of capital that is backing the firm’s investment activities. Mathara [12] points out that the risk management function has been regarded as an advisory function for senior management rather than a control function within the business. This has rendered the risk managers impotent when they see things going wrong but are ignored by senior management.

2.2 Theoretical Review

The study anchors on shiftability theory and anticipated income theory because the two theories are relevant to this study.

2.3 Shiftability Theory

This theory postulates that by making short-term commercial transactions that will mature in a timely manner will keep banks in a ready state to meet the demands of their depositors. According to Okoh et al. [13], Shiftability theory allows the banking system run more efficiently with fewer reserves or investing in long-term assets and also under this theory, the banking system tries to avoid liquidity crises by enabling banks to always sell or repo at good prices. Moti et al. [14] accords that the theory assumes that assets need not be tied on only self-liquidating bills, but also held in other shiftable open-market assets, such as government securities. However, one shortcoming of the Shiftability Theory, similar to one that led the banking system away from the orthodox theory, was that in times of stress or crisis, the effectiveness of these assets for liquidity purposes goes away as there is no market for them [15]. If all banks are looking to liquidate assets, they are doing so at a cost because it would be difficult to find buyers, meaning lower prices for the assets and ultimately by doing so would not leave the banking system as a whole in a more liquid condition [16].

2.4 Anticipated Income Theory

Anticipated income theory developed in 1945 by H. V Prochnow and presented on his book named “Term loan and Theories of Bank Liquidity”. The theory considered the following factors; bond and securities can be used as collateral to give term loan so bank can collect fund in times of emergencies by selling them in the secondary market or by keeping it as collateral to the central bank. Nwanna and Oguezeue [17] argue that under the anticipated income theory banks’ management can plan its liquidity based on the expected income of the borrower and this enables the bank to grant a medium and long-term loans, in addition to short-term loans as long as the repayment of these loans are linked by the borrowers expected income to be paid in the periodic and regular premiums, and that will enable the bank to provide high liquidity, when the cash inflows are regular and can be expected. The theory recognises that certain types of loans have more liquidity than others. On the basis of this theory, bank management adopted a ladder effect in the investment portfolio. Banks ensured a certain amount of securities maturing annually and at times when funds might be demanded lending or withdrawal. However, there was no clue about the future income of the borrower.

2.5 Empirical Review

Prior studies on the effect of credit risk management on the performance of banks in Nigeria and abroad have conflicting and inconclusive results. For example, studies in Nigeria such as Ogunlade and Oseni [1] who
examined the influence of credit management on the financial performance of Nigerian banks with specific reference to First bank Plc. Their findings reveal that credit management practices have a significant positive influence on the financial performance of the First bank. In a similar study, Nwanna and Ogueze [17] examine the nexus between credit management and profitability (ROA) of Deposit Money Banks (DMBs) in Nigeria context for the period of 2006 to 2015. Findings of their study reveal that loans and advances and loan loss provision have a positive and insignificant effect on profitability, while non-performing loan has a negative and insignificant effect on profitability. In the same vein, Uwuigbe et al. [18] assess the effects of credit risk management on banks' performance in Nigeria. Their findings indicate that ratio of non-performing loans and bad debt do have a significant negative effect on the performance of banks in Nigeria, on the other hand, the relationship between secured and unsecured loan ratio and bank’s performance was not significant.

Rufai [19] examines the effect of efficiency of credit risk management on the Performance of Banks in Nigeria with particular reference to Union Bank PLC (2006-2010). The result indicates that credit risk management has a strong effect on the performance of Union Bank PLC. In a similar study, Idowu and Awoyemi [20] investigate the impact of credit risk management on the Commercial Banks Performance in Nigeria between 2005 and 2011. In the model, Return on Equity (ROE) and Return on Asset (ROA) were used as the performance indicators while Non-Performing Loans (NPL) and Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR) as credit risk management indicators. The findings reveal that credit risk management has a significant impact on the profitability of commercial banks in Nigeria. In another study, Taiwo et al. [21] also evaluate the impact of credit risk management on bank profitability of some selected commercial banks in Nigeria for the period of 2006 to 2012. The results show that credit risk management has a significant impact on the profitability of Nigeria banks.

The impact of credit risk management and capital adequacy on banks financial performance in Nigeria has been evaluated [22]. The study used variables of loan loss provisions (LLP), loans and advances (LA), non-performing loans (NPL), capital adequacy (CA) and return on asset (ROA). Panel data model was used to estimate the relationship that exists among variables. Results showed that sound credit risk management and capital adequacy impacted positively on bank’s financial performance with the exception of loans and advances which was found to have a negative impact on banks’ profitability in the period under study. In another study, Kargi [23] examines the impact of credit risk on the profitability of Nigerian banks. Findings from the study revealed that credit risk management has a significant impact on the profitability of Nigerian banks.

However, Alalade et al. [24] examine the impact of managing credit risk and profitability of banks in Lagos state. The correlation coefficient was used to decide whether or not credit risk management has an impact on profitability. The results reveal that credit risk management has a negative impact on profitability. In a similar study, Kolapo et al. [25] investigates the quantitative effect of credit risk on the performance of commercial banks in Nigeria for the period 2000-2010. Findings from their study showed that the effect of credit risk on bank performance measured by the return on assets of banks is cross-sectional invariant. Their findings did not support the claim that credit risk management has a positive and significant effect on the performance banks in Nigeria.

2.6 Empirical Review on Other Countries

In Rwanda, Kagoyire and Shukla [26] determine the effect of credit management on the financial performance of commercial banks. Results reveal that client appraisal; credit risk control and collection policy had an effect on the financial performance of Equity bank in Rwanda. Another study in Ghana, Kwaku [27] assess credit risk management practices in the Banking Industry of Ghana. The result indicated that the bank had documented policy guidelines on credit risk management with senior managers having oversight responsibility for implementation. Result also revealed that there were some implementation challenges of the credit risk policies which have resulted in the low quality of the loan portfolio of the bank. Another similar study in Bangladesh, Lalon [28] examines the impact of credit risk management on the financial performance of commercial banks of Bangladesh. Results show that the relationship between credit risk management and banks profitability is positive. Similar study in
Nepal, Osuka and Amako [29] examine the impact of the credit risk management in bank's financial performance in Nepal for the period of 2001 to 2011. The result of the study indicates that credit risk management is an important predictor of banks' profitability and financial performance. Another similar study in China, Chen and Shuping [30] also examine the credit management of commercial banks of Lianyungang City for the small scale and medium enterprises (SMEs). The result shows that the risk management plan and operation method that suit for credit demand for the SMEs is still not mature and it caused that the bad debts and dead loan were overstocked in Lianyungang commercial bank. Result also reveals that credit management has a negative impact on the performance of commercial banks.

However, Musyoki [31] evaluates the impact of credit risk management on the financial performance of Banks in Kenya for The Period 2000-2006. Result reveals that credit risk management parameters have an inverse impact on banks' financial performance in Kenya for the study period. In addition, Poudel [32] investigate the factors affecting commercial bank performance in Nepal for the period of 2001 to 2012. The study reveals a significant inverse relationship between commercial bank performance measured by ROA and credit risk measured by default rate and capital adequacy ratio. Hosna et al. [33] also examines the effect of credit risk management on banks performance of four Swedish banks covering a period of 2000 to 2008. The result shows that the rate of the non-performing loan and capital adequacy ratios were inversely related to ROE through the degrees vary from one bank to the other. Their studies also contract the claim of previous studies that credit risk management has a positive effect on banks profitability.

3. METHODOLOGY

Research Design: Ex-post facto research design was adopted for this study. Ex-post facto research is a methodological verifiable investigation which the researcher cannot manipulate the independent variables because they apparently had occurred or because they are intrinsic not manipulated. Ex-post facto research attempts to explain the possible relationship between a set of independent variables and dependent variables or to determine the influence of a variable on another [34].

Sampling Technique and Sample size: Purposive sampling technique was used to select Zenith bank, Guaranty bank, First bank, Access bank and United bank for Africa out of 20 Deposit Money Banks operating in Nigeria. The choice of these banks is base on the fact that there are five banks being ranked among 1000 global banks by The Banker Magazine in 2018 and it is expected to have the same credit risk management apparatus.

Method of Data Collection: Secondary data was used for this study. It was adopted from the audited financial statements of the listed banks in the Nigerian Stock Exchange (NSE), for the period of the year 2006 – 2017. This study also made use of Nigerian Stock Exchange Fact Book 2017 for the Nigerian banks and CBN bulletin 2017. Most of the yearly reports that were inaccessible in the NSE fact book were obtained from the corporate offices of concerned banks and were also downloaded from their corporate websites.

The validity of Instrument: Validity is to check whether the measuring instrument measures what it intends to measure. The instruments used for the study are among the instruments adjudged by experts in the field as suitable.

Reliability of Instrument: Reliability of instrument has to do with the consistency or reproducibility, the degree to which the instrument consistently measures what it intends. The study made use of secondary data; published audited annual financial statements of the firms. The process of preparing the audited financial statement had followed the stringent accounting standard both national and international.

Method of Data Analysis: Panel data was used since it incorporates time series and cross-sectional data. The method of analysis used descriptive statistics and Linear Regressions.
Table 1. Definition of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Performing Loan Ratio</td>
<td>Non-performing loan ratio is a ratio between the banks total loans and total deposits [6]. If the ratio goes above 25%, is an indication that the bank is getting into the zone of weak credit risk control system [6].</td>
<td>( NPLR = \frac{NPL}{Total\ Loan} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Adequacy Ratio</td>
<td>Capital adequacy ratio is the proportion of the bank's tier 1 &amp; tier 2 equity (Qualifying Capital or Equity) as a proportion of its risk weighted assets (loans). It is the proportion of a bank's own equity in relation to its risk exposure [6].</td>
<td>( CAR = \frac{Total\ Equity}{Total\ Asset} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan-Deposit Ratio</td>
<td>Loan-deposit ratio, also known as the LTD ratio, is a ratio between the bank's total loans and total deposits. If the ratio is lower than 1, the bank relied on its own deposits to make loans to its customers, without any outside borrowing. If, on the other hand, the ratio is greater than 1, the bank borrowed money which it refinanced at higher rates, rather than relying entirely on its own deposits [6].</td>
<td>( LTDR = \frac{Total\ Loan\ and\ Advances}{Total\ Deposit} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROA</td>
<td>This is the earnings of the firm based on its total before taxes and other interest charges are deducted divided by the total asset.</td>
<td>( ROA = \frac{Earnings\ before\ interest\ and\ tax}{Total\ assets} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE</td>
<td>Total earnings before interest and taxes divided by shareholders equity of the firm.</td>
<td>( ROE = \frac{Earnings\ before\ interest\ and\ tax}{Total\ Equity} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 Mathematical Model

Few available studies in Nigeria used different indicators to measure credit risk management and financial performance. For example, Uwuigbe et al. [18] in their study, they used bad debt, non-performing loans, secured and unsecured loans to measure credit risk management, while bank performance was measured as profit after tax. Ogboi [22] and Kolapo et al. [25] also used variables of loan loss provisions (LLP), loans and advances (LA), non-performing loans (NPL) and capital adequacy (CA) to measure credit risk management while return on asset (ROA) was used to measure financial performance. Kargi [23] in his study, measured profitability with Return on Asset (ROA) as a function of the ratio of Non-performing loan to loan & advances (NPL/LA) and the ratio of Total loan & Advances to Total deposit (LA/TD) used as indicators of credit risk. Also, Nwanna and Oguezie [17] in their study, they made use of loans and advances, non-performing loan and loan loss provisions to measure credit risk management, while return on assets and return on equity was employed to measure financial performance.

This current study, therefore, adopts Non-Performing Loan Ratio, Capital Adequacy Ratio and Loan-Deposit Ratio as credit risk management apparatus, while financial performance is measured by Return on Assets (ROA) and Return on Equity (ROE).

**Model I**

Return on Asset = f (Non-Performing Loan Ratio, Capital Adequacy Ratio, Loan-Deposit Ratio)

\[ ROA = \beta_0 + \beta_1 NPLR + \beta_2 CAAR + \beta_3 LODR + U_i \]

**Model II**

Return on Equity = f (Non-Performing Loan Ratio, Capital Adequacy Ratio, Loan-Deposit Ratio)

\[ ROE = \beta_0 + \beta_1 NPLR + \beta_2 CAAR + \beta_3 LODR + U_i \]

Where;

\[ NPLR = \text{Non-Performing Loan Ratio} \]
\[ CAAR = \text{Capital Adequacy Ratio} \]
LODR = Loan-Deposit Ratio
\( \beta_0 = \) intercept
\( \beta_1 - \beta_3 = \) Regression coefficient of the independent variables.

4. DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From Table 2, Return on Assets (ROA) measured by total earnings of the firm based on its total before taxes and other interest charges are deducted divided by the total asset ranges from 2-7%. It has a mean value of 4.6% and a standard deviation value of 1.6%. This implies that on average the study banks in Nigeria earned a 4.6% return on assets per year with a 1.6% standard deviation. Also, Return on Equity (ROE) measured by total earnings before interest and taxes divided by shareholders equity of the firm ranges from 8-51%. It has mean and standard deviation values of 28.6% and 13.56% respectively. This indicates that on average the study banks in Nigeria earned a 28.6% return on equity per year with a 13.56% standard deviation. Prior studies affirm that Return on equity between 15% and 20% is considered desirable [6]. This indicates that the selected banks in Nigeria have been performing above desirable rage during the periods under study. However, Navapan and Tripe [35] argues that getting this much return on equity may not always send a good signal, but it may also result from having a small, inefficient and less competitive market.

Non-performing loan ratio is a ratio between the banks total loans and total deposits. Table 2 reveals that average NPLR in selected banks for the periods under study was 8.7% with standard deviation of 2.2%. The difference between minimum value (4%) and the maximum value (12%) as well as standard deviation indicates that there is no that much variation among banks credit risk exposures. Also, CAR ratio measured by the proportion of owners’ equity to total assets having a minimum of 7% and a maximum of 31% with a mean value and standard deviation of 14% and 6.9% respectively. The average amount of CAR is higher than the international minimum of 8% set by BASEL for commercial banks globally. This implies that the selected banks have capital adequacy ratio to protect the depositors’ funds from credit risk and other failure.

In Table 2, LTDR which was measured by the proportion of also total loan and advance to total deposit. The average LTDR in the selected banks for the periods under study was 81.9% with a standard deviation of 45%. The minimum value and maximum values are 35% and 200% respectively. This is suggesting that the selected banks concentrating on lending venture rather those other viable options.

4.1 Diagnostic Test

Diagnostic tests such as heteroscedasticity and multicollinearity test were conducted to decide whether the model used in the study is appropriate and fulfill the assumption of the classical linear regression model.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of dependent and independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.0460</td>
<td>.01616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.2858</td>
<td>.13561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.0868</td>
<td>.02278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.1404</td>
<td>.06919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTDR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.8192</td>
<td>.45827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Heteroscedasticity and Multicollinearity test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised coefficients</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.843</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>0.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NLPR</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CARR</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LTDR</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: AbUt
Source: SPSS output
Table 4. Influence of credit risk management on return on assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
<th>t-statistics</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.583</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>3.721</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPR</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>14.639</td>
<td>2.455</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARR</td>
<td>11.246</td>
<td>3.326</td>
<td>7.206</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTDR</td>
<td>6.300</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>4.503</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbin-Watson</td>
<td>2.739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F- statistics</td>
<td>104.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: ROA

Table 5. Influence of credit risk management on return on equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. error</th>
<th>t-statistics</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.975</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>2.381</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLPR</td>
<td>-1.571</td>
<td>7.415</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARR</td>
<td>17.982</td>
<td>4.724</td>
<td>3.807</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTDR</td>
<td>3.227</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>2.242</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbin-Watson</td>
<td>1.902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F- Statistics</td>
<td>98.107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: ROE

Based on the output from the Table 3, coefficients obtained the value of Sig. NLPR variable of 0.779, the Sig. CARR variable of 0.383 and, the sig. LTDR variable of 0.353, meaning that the value of the variable sig NLPR, CARR and LTDR > 0.05, it can be concluded that there is no heteroscedasticity problem. Also, from Table 3, the values of VIF of NLPR, CARR and LTDR are 2.938, 2.612 and 5.353 respectively are greater than 1 but less than 10 which was the benchmark for multicollinearity. This means there is no multicollinearity among the independent variables in the model.

4.2 Variables Regression Model

The result obtained using the Ordinary Least Square (OLS) estimation technique. ROA = 5.583 + 0.809NLPR + 11.246CARR + 6.300LTDR. The result in Table 4 shows that the predictor variables (i.e NLPR, CARR and LTDR) were significantly joint predictors of ROA (F = 104.09; R^2 = 0.373; P<0.05). The predictor variables jointly explained 37.3% of ROA, while the remaining 62.7% could be due to the effect of extraneous variables. Furthermore, it can be deduced from the result obtained that the constant parameter in the long – run is positive. This implies that if all the explanatory variables are held constant, ROA will increase by 5.583 units. And also NLPR (β = 0.809; t = 2.455; P <.05), CARR (β = 11.246; t = 7.206; P <.05) and LTDR(β = 6.300; t = 4.503; P <.05) were significant independent predictors of ROA. This implies that a unit increase in NLPR, CARR and LTDR will lead to an increase in ROA by 0.81units, 11.25 units and 7.206 units respectively.

The result obtained using the Ordinary Least Square (OLS) estimation technique. ROE = 2.975- 1.571NLPR + 17.982CARR + 3.227LTDR. Table 5 reveals that the predictor variables (i.e NLPR, CARR and LTDR) were significantly joint predictors of ROE (F = 98.107; R^2 = 0.734; P<.05). The predictor variables jointly explained 73.4% of ROE, while the remaining 26.6.7% could be due to the effect of extraneous variables. Furthermore, it can be deduced from the result obtained that the constant parameter in the long – run is positive. This implies that if all the explanatory variables are held constant, ROE will increase by 3units. And also CARR (β = 17.982; t = 3.807; P <.05) and LTDR(β = 3.227; t = 2.242; P <.05) were significant independent predictors of ROE. However, NLPR (β = -1.57; t = -0.212; P <.05) has negative influence on ROE.
This implies that a unit increase in CARR and LTDR will lead to an increase in ROE by 18 units and 3 units respectively, while a unit increase in NLPR will lead to a decrease ROE by 1.6 units. This study is consistent with Bizuayehu [6].

The implication of this finding is that credit risk management apparatus are major predictors of financial performance in the selected banks.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study examines the influence of credit risk management on the performance of Nigerian banks with particular reference to selected banks. Purposive sampling technique was used to select five Nigerian banks being ranked among 1000 global banks by The Banker Magazine in 2018. The credit risk management measured by Non-Performing Loan Ratio, Capital Adequacy Ratio and Loan-Draft Ratio have a significant positive influence on financial performance measured by return on assets. Moreover, the study confirms that credit risk management measured by Non-Performing Loan Ratio, Capital Adequacy Ratio and Loan-Draft Ratio has a significant positive influence on financial performance measured by return on equity except Non-Performing Loan Ratio. It is concluded that credit risk management apparatus employed by the selected banks for the periods of study have a significant influence on their financial performance.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusion the following recommendations are made:

1. Regulatory should implement a new code of corporate governance that bank directors with non-performing loans (NPLs) are to either quit or be sacked. And also banks’ boards to remove any director with insider non-performing loans.
2. Banks should have formidable credit policies and standards that conform to regulatory requirements and also banks’ credit and loan officers should be well trained by attending seminars and conferences on credit risk management in Nigeria and abroad so as to further reduce the level of their credit risk exposure.
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